



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

we show, as we hope to do, that his case utterly breaks down, and that his arguments wholly fail to establish the point which he wishes to prove, our readers need not imagine that any stronger arguments on that side remain behind.

Mr. Rourke's arguments are reducible to two heads—arguments from Scripture, and from reason, or "common sense." We have, in conformity with the plan which we had laid down for ourselves in our August number (*vide* page 86) discussed in a separate article the proofs alleged from Scripture in support of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, and as that article (see page 121) includes the texts brought forward by our correspondent, we content ourselves here with replying to the other topics which he has introduced in his letter.

**ARGUMENT I.**—"Every work of God is perfect in its kind; the Church is most emphatically the work of God, and must therefore, be perfect, and consequently must have the main perfection of always teaching truth."

If this argument were a good one, we might go on to reason in like manner thus—If the Church be perfect, it must have the main perfection of always having a perfect Head; but the Pope is the recognised head of the Church of Rome; either, therefore, any given Pope (for example, Alexander VI.\*) was perfect, or else the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ.

But though this conclusion (which follows legitimately from our correspondent's principles) may be more satisfactory to us than to him, we must confess that the argument is not a good one. Its fallacy is that it assumes that our "common sense" is sufficient to decide what amount of perfection any work of God must of necessity possess. Test the argument by applying it to a similar case, and the falsity of the assumption becomes at once apparent. In place of the word "Church," let us insert the word "man"—or, to make the matter clearer, imagine Adam in the Garden of Eden, to have reasoned thus concerning himself—"Every work of God is perfect in its kind; I am emphatically the work of God, declared by God himself to be very good (Gen. i. 31); consequently I must have the main perfection of always doing right." But it was only before the fall that this could pass for a good argument. The fall, alas, has taught us that works of God, declared by himself to have been originally created perfect, are liable to the corruption of evil. God designed his Church to possess perfect truth and perfect holiness, in the same way in which he designed man to possess similar qualities; and whenever we can give a satisfactory account of the entrance of evil into the world, we shall then also be able to explain why God permitted corruption to assail the doctrines and undermine the purity of his Church.

**ARGUMENT II.**—Without an absolute and infallible tribunal, there can be no certainty. "He who renounces the infallible authority of the Church has no longer any sure means to secure him against uncertainties, and to settle his doubts; he is in a sad and perplexed situation, tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine."

If this argument be good, we may reason, too—"Without an infallible certainty that we have an infallible guide, we must be full of doubt and perplexity. For what should we think of a man who said that he would never think it safe to live in a house unless the ground floor were built of solid stone, and yet who never troubled himself to think whether there were good foundations. For it is evident that the certainty of the man who professes that he is following an infallible guide, can never rise higher than whatever certainty he may have that his guide is infallible. Now, how is this proposition to be proved? Not on the testimony of the professed infallible guide himself, for it would be absurd to admit any one's claims to infallibility merely because we had his own word for it. No; it is established by the same kind of proofs from Scripture and from reason as Mr. Rourke has here employed, and as Protestants are accustomed to employ in proof of the articles of their faith. If, then, it be possible, by Scripture and reason alone, to obtain a certain proof of the infallibility of the Church of Rome (a doctrine about which the Bible is strangely silent, as we have observed elsewhere) much more may Protestants obtain, in the same way, certain proofs of their articles of faith, all of which do happen to be mentioned in Scripture. On the other hand, if Protestants cannot attain to any certainty for want of an infallible guide, neither can this proposition, "that an infallible guide exists," ever be certainly proved, since in the proof of it the assertion of the guide claiming infallibility cannot be admitted to reckon for anything.

It may be well to add a caution as to the sense in which we use the word "certainty." A man is not certain because he is positive in his opinions, and is free from all doubt and hesitation. It would be no recommendation to any system that its adherents were all confident they were in the right, unless it could be shown that their confidence rested on good grounds. But, in point of fact, men's confidence in the correctness of their opinions, depends more on their temperament than on the religious system to which they belong. Thus, it is not true that all members of the Church of Rome are free from all doubt. Not to speak of the infidelity which has too often arisen from her over-strained demands on men's credulity, many of the thoughtful members of her communion must be disturbed by an uneasy conviction that there is something unsound

in the basis of her enormous structure. While again, as to the grand question, "Is the Church of Rome fallible or infallible?" no Roman Catholic can be more completely free from all doubt and hesitation than we are ourselves.

Again, this certainty we are speaking of is not the certainty of mathematical demonstration. God has judged fit that, in matters of religion, we should be obliged to act, not on mathematical demonstration, but on evidence of the same nature as determines our conduct in the common affairs of life; even those in which our most important earthly interests are concerned. When, therefore, we assert that proofs drawn from Scripture and reason are sufficient (*if they be good ones*) to produce certainty, without the authority of an infallible guide, we mean to say that they are sufficient to produce such a well-grounded confidence as renders doubt practically unreasonable.

**ARGUMENT III.**—"Without an infallible tribunal, unanimity in faith is a thing impossible. Men can never come to the same way of thinking without some living oracle to determine the mind. Unity of faith is found by experience to exist nowhere but in the Roman Catholic Church."

It certainly must be acknowledged, that the Christian world is very far from being united, but is, on the contrary, broken up into a great variety of sects. We shall not now inquire whether the points of agreement between the principal of them are not more numerous and of more importance than Roman Catholic writers would represent; but we shall admit this disunion as a melancholy fact. But now we are wholly at a loss to see how this division of the Christian world into sects affords an argument in favour of any one of them. Any one sect may, if it pleases, set itself on one side, and all the rest on the other, and exclaim, "See here is unity on the one side, and on the other disunion." Members of the Greek Church might say, "Here are all we Greeks united, while you Westerns, some of you call yourself Roman Catholics, some of you Presbyterians, &c." Or, again, the Quakers might say, "See what perfect unity there is amongst us." One of our "Friends comes from the remotest part of America or Australia, and yet our thoughts and principles about religion and its mysteries are exactly alike. Pray, is that unity to be found among you who use carnal ordinances, broken up as you are into hundreds of different Churches, each styling itself the Church of Christ?" We do not see why the argument is not as good in the mouth of the Greek Church, or of the Quakers, as it is in that of the Roman Catholics, when they triumph in the fact that they agree with themselves, and that those who disagree with them do not agree with each other.

Once upon a time a jury, after a night spent in stormy discussion, were called into court, and asked by the judge, "Gentlemen, do you agree in your verdict?" "Yes, my lord," said the foreman. "No, no," exclaimed half-a-dozen voices from the jury-box. "How is this?" said the judge. "Why, my lord," replied the foreman, "it is true, there are seven or eight wrong-headed fellows, who refuse to submit to the decision of the foreman, and who, therefore, don't deserve to be reckoned as jury-men; but, not counting them, we are all agree."

We leave our intelligent readers to make their own application of the story to the manner in which Romanists make out the unity of the Church, by simply *not counting* those who differ from them.

But, perhaps, when we say that the Quakers are as much united among themselves as the Roman Catholics, it may be replied, "But they are not near so numerous." "We are two hundred millions," says Mr. Rourke; and though we believe this computation is about double the truth, there is no doubt the Roman Catholics do considerably outnumber the Quakers. We beg our readers, however, to turn back to the article in our last April number (page 40), "Are Numbers a Test of Truth?" We showed there that if truth were to be judged of by the numbers of its adherents, Romanism must be condemned, since there are more Christians who are not Roman Catholics than those who are; nay, Christianity herself must be condemned, since the Christians are far outnumbered by the heathens; and we showed that numbers cannot be used as a test of truth by any one who remembers our Lord's warning—"Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. Narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there are that find it."

It must be added that the unity in the Church of Rome is more apparent than real. We need not speak of the dissensions that have so often torn her communion; the debates about the superiority of a Council to the Pope—about the immaculate conception, and a hundred others, which Protestants cannot easily forget, and which we may possibly discuss more at large hereafter; but even when there is outward agreement, what is this worth unless it be the result of agreement between men who are thinking independently and judging for themselves? But the Church of Rome discourages independent examination into the truth by her members; she prefers that they should assent to her dogmas without inquiry; and where she has the power she suppresses all expressions of dissent from those who are not convinced by her authority. She thus obtains a number of voices to resound her doctrines; but what are they all but echoes of a single voice? Numbers of those whom she keeps in ignorance do agree with each other, just as in the dark all things are the same colour. It only requires light to make their differences appear. But this

is not the unity which distinguishes the Church of Christ. That unity is, as a distinguished man described it, "Not the unity of belief in the bond of ignorance—nor unity of profession in the bond of hypocrisy—but unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

We cannot leave the subject, however, without retorting our correspondent's argument. We say that the dissensions which exist among Christians are a sufficient argument that God has not interfered to prevent them by supplying them with a living infallible guide. Let any man say, is it a credible assertion, that God, with the view of securing absolute unity in his Church, supplied it with a living infallible guide, and yet that he so neglected to supply this guide with credentials, that considerably more than half the Christian world have, in consequence, been unable to satisfy themselves of his infallibility, and have been, therefore, as much divided among themselves as if no such guide had been given; and this when a single text in the Bible, "Receive the Bishop of Rome as the infallible interpreter of my will," would have settled the whole matter. Is it credible that God instituted an infallible Church or purpose to prevent disputes, and yet that he should have left the question, Is the Church infallible? the most disputed point in all theology. Would he have left it a disputable point where men were to settle their disputes? We conclude, therefore, that whatever be the evils of disunion in the Church, God has not thought fit to prevent them by relieving man from the necessity of searching the truth for themselves, and by imposing upon them a guide whom they could certainly know to be infallible.

Having now discussed the leading arguments of our correspondent, we are compelled, by want of space, to abstain from commenting on some of his incidental remarks, which offer a tempting subject for correction. Our conclusion, then, as to the result of the whole argument on the subject of infallibility, from reason and common sense, is—Our correspondent has succeeded in showing that infallibility is what we should fancy to be a great perfection in a Church—that if we had any infallible way of knowing where an infallible judge was to be found, it would relieve us from all need of hesitation, and would make Christians more united than they are at present. All this, however, does not approach to being proof that such an infallible guide exists. If so, we might make out just as good a proof that Holloway's pills would cure the cholera; since undoubtedly it would be a great benefit to have a certain cure for that disease, and would free us from much doubt and hesitation, and would prevent the doctors from differing with each other. It would certainly be a comfortable world if the mere circumstance that we should like to have a thing was a sufficient proof that we had got it.

We must be satisfied for the present with having demolished all the arguments that have been brought from reason and common sense for the infallibility of the Church; but did space permit, we should like to show that we can discern many reasons why God should not have given Christians an infallible guide. For it would be easy to prove that the result of men's having, or thinking they had such a guide, would be that the people would sink into uninquiring ignorance and neglect of the Word of God. Our remarks on this head must be reserved for some other opportunity.

## ON THE VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In apology for trespassing still farther upon your courtesy, in resuming a protracted discussion, I beg, very respectfully, to urge again the paramount importance of the subject, and the lively interest I feel in it. Being led to expect, in last month's publication, an explicit elucidation of your opinions respecting the visibility of the Church, I felt much disappointed in finding that you had been expatiating the writings of St. Augustine, for the purpose of deducing premises, which, if once admitted, would lead to most preposterous consequences—viz., "That some lying in heresies, and in the superstition of the Gentiles, are of the number of the elect, who truly constitute the Church; and that even schismatics in those things in which they do not separate, are in connection with the Church." (C. I. Oct., 53, p. 113.)

Relying, I presume, on some tortuous explanation of the above isolated passages, you will make room by your side for the Pelagians, the Eutychians, the Nestorians, the Socinians, "et hoc genus omne," the spawn of heretics, who have just as much connection with the Church as lopped off branches have with the parent tree. Far from shunning those who cause divisions (Rom. xvi. 17), you do not disown even Pagan superstitions. This, sir, I beg to retort upon you, is but your own individual opinion. I deny that it is a true exposition of Protestant doctrine, and I call upon you to prove the affirmative by such evidence as you require of others—viz., creeds, liturgies, public documents, or formularies of faith.

The residue of your somewhat elaborate dissertation amounts merely to what is briefly expressed in the 26th Article of the Church of England—"That in the visible Church the evil is ever mingled with the good, and sometimes preponderates." Though this may be, alas! too true, though the worldly and wicked may outnumber the moral, the pure, and the regenerate, still the latter will preserve the faith (Matthew xvi. 18; Isaiah lxii. 6,) and the form of sound words (1 Tim. vi. 20, 21, and 2 Tim. i.

\*See our article, p. 123.

13), to which formula, if the degenerate will not submit, the faithful will at once disenthral themselves from the degrading connection, and unite in a separate community, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. vi. 10. I appeal to candid and enlightened Protestants, if the 16th Article does not distinctly refer to such "a congregation of faithful men, among whom the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance?" I am satisfied that my appeal is not in vain; for I find the above passage of the Canticles applied to the Protestant Reformed Churches, as they existed in the time of Luther, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, by one of the brightest luminaries of your Church at the present day.

But to come more decidedly to the point, you must assume, as a hypothesis, that the Church of England, and the various Protestant Churches with which she acknowledges a connection, or joins communion, constitute the true visible Church of Christ upon earth; or that they do not. If they are not the true Church of Christ, you are walking in the "the valley of the shadow of death;" and if they are the true Church of Christ, of course, this Church must have been perpetual and always visible, according to your great first principle.—(See C. L., January, '53, p. 10).

I assert, that in the beginning of the eleventh century, no Church or congregation existed professing the peculiar negative doctrines of the Church of England; or with which she can consistently identify herself; inasmuch as Protestantism, *in globo*, was condemned in the person of Berengarius. This man denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He stood alone, was condemned by the whole world, and had not one place under heaven to look to for countenance or support. Your Church was then invisible, and the undeniable consequence is, that it is not the true Church.

Respecting the faith of the Greek and Eastern Churches, I beg to refer you to the public liturgies in use amongst them.

The Græco Arabic Liturgy of St. Basil, Renaudot. tom. i. p. 153.

The Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil, Renaudot. tom. i. p. 2.

The Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril, idem. tom. i. p. 39.

The Syriac Liturgy of St. Basil, idem. tom. ii. p. 549.

The Liturgy of St. James, idem. tom. ii. p. 38, 39, with many others, including the Liturgy of St. John the Silent, used at Constantinople; some of which call the Eucharist a tremendous and unbloody sacrifice; others the life-giving flesh which Christ, our God, took from our holy Lady, Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary; others of them call it a propitiatory sacrifice, and offer it for all creatures, and for the remission of sin; and in the last-named liturgy it is expressly specified that the priest, the deacon, and the people offer, not only the marks of external adoration, by the gesture and bowing of the head, but also internal adoration, by the prayers addressed to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. Read also pages 204 and 205 of the Hammersmith Discussion, London edition, 1841, where the eloquent and talented controversialist, Rev. J. Cumming, unhesitatingly admits that the Greek and Eastern Churches always retained this dogma. See also, Townsend's Accusations of History against the Church of Rome, page 105, where he acknowledges that the Greek Churches, in their public liturgies, invoke the saints and the Blessed Virgin: and that they believe a purgatory, or medial state, may be seen by consulting the above liturgies.

Now, sir, if you obstinately oppose yourself to this formidable phalanx, which I have arrayed against you, eminent Protestant writers, both ancient and modern, of different countries, public liturgies and the articles of your own Church, &c., I can well afford to leave you to the indulgence of this very singular and unenviable scepticism.

In order to elicit some tangible or definite avowal from you, I have assumed successively the Roman, the Greek, and Eastern Churches to be the true visible Church of Christ. "Oh!" you say, "our correspondent, by an instinct peculiar to his tribe, is ever taking a part for the whole—we did not mean any one part, but the whole." That is to say:—The Church of Rome—the Scarlet Lady, and the Greek and Eastern Churches, denying the Holy Ghost (the error of Photinus), believing transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory and the invocation of saints—all these corrupt, erratic, superstitious, blasphemous, and idolatrous Churches to compose the true visible Church of Christ, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."

It has been asked, in derision, how many fallibles will make an infallible. *Per contra*—how many corrupt and idolatrous churches will make the pure Church of Christ—"the pillar and the ground of truth?" I need not press this argument farther. Your readers will see that you have not got out of the dilemma in which I placed you respecting the Greek and Eastern Churches; and that you did not account for the fact of Berenger's not appealing to any of them for sympathy or protection, and not adducing their authority to support his own heterodox opinions.

Besides, you must be aware that there were, at the time of Berengarius, many Greek Churches in Italy, particularly at Venice; and that the Emperor still retained possession of a part of Italy—which part obeyed the Patriarch of Constantinople; and even if this were not the case, I do not see what was to prevent Berengarius from

going over to the Greeks, if they espoused his cause, as you would seem to insinuate, even when Rome was in her glory.

I will not presume to violate an established rule, by entering into the merits of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which you have shown such an anxiety to drag into the present controversy, though quite a distinct topic; but if you are not wedded to a set of opinions, or too much devoted to party interests to propose your arguments manfully, and let them stand or fall by their own merits, I am sure you can dispose of the subject of the visibility by a *coup de main*; and I shall be prepared then to investigate with you the doctrine of transubstantiation—"ab ovo usque ad malum."

Φιλαληθς.

Dated 1st November, 1853.

We cannot think that so intelligent a correspondent as "Philaletes" would have written so much to us that is quite wide of the mark, if he was clearly aware what the real point of difference between us is. His present letter enables us, we hope, to bring the matter to a point, and to set the subject in a clear point of view.

He asks us, as a very puzzling question, with what Church of the eleventh century does the present Church of England identify herself? We answer very simply—with the Church of England, to be sure. We hold that the Church presided over by Archbishop Sumner, who now fills the See of Canterbury, is identical with that presided over by Lanfranc, who filled the same see, at the time referred to by "Philaletes." We believe this to be as historically certain as it is that Dr. Wiseman, the head of the Roman Catholics in England, is not the successor of Lanfranc or Augustine, but the first occupier of a bran-new see, made about three years ago. But, then, since we do not believe in the *infallibility* of the Church, we do not hold, and are not bound to prove that the doctrines held in the eleventh century are exactly the same as those taught in the nineteenth century. We maintain that the Church of England in those days taught, in addition to the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, some errors from which she is now happily free, though we also maintain that the Church of England, in the eleventh century, was free from some errors (as, for example, the notion of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary), with which the Church of Rome is now infected. Does not "Philaletes" now see that all he has written about the visibility of the Church does not affect our views in the least? What he has to prove is her perpetual *purity*. If he can show that it is impossible that any error whatever can be taught in any part of the Church of Christ, then, without going back to the eleventh century, the Church of England, which professes to have reformed herself in the 16th, is condemned at once. But until he has proved this, the line of argument "Philaletes" has taken is only calculated to excite prejudice against his views. He plunges into the very darkest period of the Church's history, and calls on us to believe, not as the Apostles believed—not as the primitive Church believed—but as the eleventh century believed. What force has this until it is proved that the belief of the majority of Christians in the eleventh century must necessarily be in every respect the same as that of Christians in the first and second? We recommend "Philaletes" to examine well the foundations of his argument, and to entertain suspicions of those who shrink from light, and who would send him to grope in the dark ages for his religion.

What we have said would, we think, be a sufficient reply; but as we should be sorry "Philaletes" should think we were disposed to treat his argument lightly, we shall go a little more fully into the matter with him, even at the risk of wearying some of our readers.

"Philaletes" accuses us of "expiscating" St. Augustine. If "expiscating" a man be a wrong thing to do, and if we have done it, we are very sorry; but as we really do not know what it means, we are at a loss whether to plead guilty or not.

If "expiscating St. Augustine" means quoting from St. Augustine's works passages which are contrary to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and therefore seem "preposterous" to "Philaletes," we are then very sorry that the Church of Rome should have departed from the doctrine of St. Augustine, and that "Philaletes" should be offended at him. But if this be our offence, we fear we shall have to "expiscate" all the Fathers in turn.

"Philaletes" accuses us of "deducing premises from St. Augustine, which, if once admitted, would lead to most preposterous consequences—viz., that some, lying in heresies and in the superstition of the Gentiles, are of the number of the elect, who truly constitute the Church." Now, these were the words of St. Augustine, which we quoted—"There are some of that number (the elect) who, as yet, are living wickedly, and are lying even in heresies, or in the superstitions of the Gentiles; and yet, even there the Lord knoweth them that are his; for in that *unspeakable foreknowledge of God*, many who seem to be without are indeed within, and many who seem to be within are without. Of all those who, so to speak, inwardly and hiddenly are within, consists that garden enclosed, that fountain sealed, that well of living water."

We drew no conclusions from this; much less such preposterous conclusions as "Philaletes" seems to fancy do follow from it; but which, if he had looked at the words marked in italics, he would never have dreamed of. We only asked Roman Catholics to consider how St. Augustine

distinguished between the Church visible and invisible, and we still ask them to do so.

"Philaletes" retorts that this is only our individual opinion. We say it is St. Augustine's opinion, not ours. He denies it to be "a true exposition of Protestant doctrine," and calls on us "to prove it by such evidence as we require from others—viz., creeds, liturgies, public documents, or formularies of faith." A very fair demand, provided "Philaletes" will allow us, for this purpose, the free use of *all* the formularies of the Church of England and Ireland. It was natural, perhaps, that "Philaletes" should forget the Holy Scriptures as a source of proof; but we must remind him that it is the *chief* "formulary of faith" in the Church of England and Ireland. The Sixth Article adopts all that is "read therein, or may be proved thereby." Everything relating to faith that we find in the Bible is adopted by that Sixth Article. And in the Bible we find St. Paul thus speaking of himself—"When it pleased him (God), who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace to reveal his Son in me." (Galatians i. 15, 16, Douay Bible.) This is exactly what St. Augustine means. St. Paul spent the first part of his life in spiritual pride, in blasphemy and persecution; yet, "in that unspeakable foreknowledge of God," St. Paul was "separated from his mother's womb;" and yet no Christian was to hear him till the Son of God was revealed in him, and so none of the preposterous consequences that "Philaletes" fears do follow from this doctrine.

The other passage in which "Philaletes" thinks we have "expiscated St. Augustine" (whatever that means) is this—"that even schismatics, in those things in which they do not separate, are in connection with the Church." Now, the facts were thus: the Donatist schism was itself founded on the notion that schism wholly separates from Christ, and from his Church, visible and invisible. St. Augustine, St. Optatus, and all the African Church, maintained the contrary; they conducted the controversy on the principle that schism does not wholly separate; they professed to treat the Donatists as still brethren in Christ, in respect of all things in which they were agreed; and the course thus taken by the African bishops was approved of at the time by the Church of Rome, and by the whole Catholic world. And we are at a loss to know why the principles of St. Augustine, Optatus, &c., should now be regarded with such aversion by the present Church of Rome, and by "Philaletes." That Donatist controversy is, indeed, most instructive in relation to the controversy of the present day; but it is too large a subject to enter on here.\* We hope to treat of it fully some other time. It will then appear who now hold the opinions which Catholics held then.

We come now to the precise question between "Philaletes and us." We are disappointed that he does not yet understand us more clearly, but still mistakes our opinions. It is perhaps natural that he should not easily comprehend opinions that are so new to him; and we are willing to take all possible pains, in hopes that we may understand each other yet.

All the difficulties which "Philaletes" raises against our view of the visible Church are no difficulties at all, except on this supposition that the visible Church must of necessity be free from all error or corruption. We have said that we believe the visible Church to be subject to error and to corruption—more or less dangerous, more or less extensive in different ages and countries. "Philaletes" thinks it enough to show that this is our opinion. But what we want is, that "Philaletes" should show us that this opinion of ours is *wrong*. Until he can show us this, he cannot expect us to give up that opinion. We hope he will now understand what our opinion is; and that he will show us (if he can) that this opinion is wrong.

We are equally anxious to understand exactly what "Philaletes" opinion is. We want to know plainly, 1st. does Philaletes think that "the visible Church must of necessity be always free from error and corruption in doctrine?" 2nd. "In the case which we are now discussing (that of Berengarius), was the Church of Rome actually right?" It is not our fault if we do not yet understand what the opinion of "Philaletes" really is about this. We have asked him these questions as plainly as we could, and he has not yet given us any answer.

We now reprint here what we said in our remarks on "Philaletes" last letter in our number for September.

"Philaletes" brought forward the fact that Berengarius was condemned, and forced to retract his opinions in various Councils. We selected the most important—that which has been put into the canon law, consisting of Pope Nicholas II. and 113 bishops, held at Rome, in the year 1059. We gave the words which Berengarius was compelled to sign—that the true body and the blood of Christ is "in a sensible manner (sensualiter) handled by the hands of the priest, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful." We affirmed that the word *sensualiter* can mean nothing else than this, "in a way that our senses can judge of and perceive." Now we want to understand what "Philaletes" thinks of this. Does he think that the Pope and Council were right—or does he think that they were wrong? He has not told us, AND WE CALL ON HIM TO TELL US: we cannot discuss this matter with him without knowing what his opinion is; WE THEREFORE CALL ON HIM TO ANSWER THIS. Our opinion is, that he will never venture to say that the Pope and Council were right."

"Philaletes" has not answered this. He leaves us still

\* We touched slightly on it in our July number, p. 71.

totally in the dark, whether he *does* believe, or *does not* believe, that the visible Church must be always free from error and corruption in doctrine, and that the Church of Rome was right in that question of Berengarius.

[Now, this is the very question at issue between "Philaletes" and us, "whether the visible Church must always be free from error and corruption in doctrine; and whether the Church of Rome was free from error in the case of Berengarius." How can we discuss that question with him, till we know which side he takes, and what his opinion is?

If he think that the visible Church is liable to error and corruption in doctrine, then he thinks as we do, and there is no difference between us about the visible Church. If he think that the visible Church is not liable to error or corruption of doctrine, and will tell us plainly that this is his opinion, then we will discuss that opinion with him. But it is not possible for us to discuss his opinion with him without knowing plainly what his opinion is.

We therefore call upon him again to answer this plain question, and when he answers it, as we hope he will in our next number, we will go on with the discussion.

In like manner, if our correspondent wishes us to discuss whether the Greek Church be a part of the visible Church of Christ, we would ask him to state his own opinion whether it be a part of the visible Church or not. If he think it is, we have no difference with him; if he think it is not, we will discuss it with him. He speaks of the Eastern Churches as "denying the Holy Ghost;" we were not aware of this; but if he can show us that it is so, we will not claim the Greek Church as a part of the visible Church of Christ.

We trust our correspondent will think that we have put the question fairly now.

### THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow.

SIR—In the last paragraph of "The Church Visible and Invisible" you earnestly invite Roman Catholics to the statement of Augustine's doctrine of the Church, then asking how can we pretend to say our Church is without "spot or wrinkle?" (Before I go farther, I consider this article the most temperate and candid that I have seen in any Protestant journal—it is almost Catholic.) When we quote "without spot or wrinkle," in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of her sons individually, for the cockle must needs grow among the wheat to the end of time.

You fairly remark that the Church is visible and invisible. Nothing can be more plain and simple, if you allow those that are yet to be gathered in to the true fold to be the invisible, and those that are now of the Church are visible. By their fruits you will know them.

Now, the true Church being always visible, as can be proved by many texts of Scripture, may I ask what became of its visibility at the dawning of the Reformation? Before Martin Luther was born there was a visible true Church; when he was a monk there was a visible true Church; when he broached his new doctrine there was a visible true Church; when he said emphatically he stood alone, there was a visible true Church. I stand alone! Against what? Against a Church—the true, visible Church. This was a true admission of Luther's. He stood alone—the one, solitary spark, that was afterwards to be fanned into a flame, as it were, by the four winds of heaven, and then settle down, like the lava of some burning mountain. This doctrine of Luther's was not in accordance with the then visible Church. Either Luther in person was the visible Church, or he was not. If he was the true Church, what became of the Church Catholic? for he could not then claim that title, and those that were afterwards his followers were not of his Church, visible or invisible, as they knew not his teaching while yet in the embryo of his brain. We no more contend for the infallibility of an individual than we do for the spiritual supremacy of the reigning monarch over the Catholic Church.

I am, sir, your obedient, humble servant,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We sincerely thank our correspondent for his kind expressions and his candid opinion of our article; and we sincerely assure him that it is our earnest desire to be, not only almost, but altogether Catholic; and that any attempt to show us where we fail to be Catholic, or where we fall into any error, will always be esteemed by us as a kindness.

We are aware that many Roman Catholics do quote "without spot or wrinkle," rather in respect of the infallibility of their Church, than for the moral rectitude of her sons individually. One chief object in that article was to lead candid Roman Catholics to consider that distinction more carefully, and to examine how far it can be sustained.

We find in Scripture many great and glorious promises made to the Church of Christ. We find also a great tendency in many Roman Catholics to apply all those promises generally to the visible Church of Rome, as she now is. We show them some promises which appear to speak of the Church as without sin, and then they admit that these must be spoken of the Church as she appears in the sight of God, who alone knows who do truly and really

belong to him. Then we show them other promises which speak of the Church as being without error, and we ask them to consider whether it may not also be possible that these promises, too, belong to the Church as God sees her, rather than to the Church as she is visible to man.

We ask them to consider why they admit that the promises of being *all holy* cannot be applied to the visible Church of Rome and to all her members; they will say—"because we see many sinful persons, popes, bishops, clergy, and laity, in her." A very good reason, no doubt. In the same way, if it should appear that the Church of Rome has really erred, then it will be equally necessary to apply, just in the same way, those promises that seem to speak of infallibility. We now ask our correspondent to consider carefully the articles now in progress in our pages about the question whether the Apocrypha be really the inspired Word of God. If, as we proceed with our proofs, he should see reason to think that the Church of Rome has really erred in this great question, he must surely then see, that promises that seem to speak of infallibility cannot be applied rightly to the visible Church of Rome; and then the article in our last paper, which he already considers "almost Catholic," may help him out of that difficulty.

We ask him, also, to consider whether the decision which the Pope and Council made against Berengarius was right or not. If he cannot venture to say it was right, why are we talking about infallibility any longer? He will find that decision again in this number, in our reply to the letter of "Philaletes."

We now ask him to consider again what he has said—"When we quote, 'without spot or wrinkle,' in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of her sons individually." Now, we think the question is—"Did St. Paul mean to say it of her infallibility and teaching?" Here are St. Paul's words, from the Douay Bible—"That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."—Eph. v. 27. Was St. Paul speaking here of infallibility in teaching, or of holiness in heart and life? It seems clear to us that St. Paul speaks of the latter; and if this be so, what right have Roman Catholics to insist on applying it to infallibility?

Our correspondent has not quite correctly understood the distinction between the Church visible and invisible. By the Church visible, we mean the Church as men see it; by the Church invisible, the Church as she really is in herself, and as God sees her—who sees all things as they really are. A man who makes an outward profession of believing and obeying the Gospel, without having the Holy Spirit in his heart, appears to men to be a member of the Church; but God, who looks into the heart, sees that such a one is no real member of the Church of Christ.

Our correspondent's difficulty about Luther reminds us of a famous saying about a famous case in the ancient Church. The stand which the great Athanasius made for the Catholic faith about the Trinity was thus described—"All the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world." Will our correspondent, therefore, deny the Trinity? Will he say, "How could Athanasius be the Catholic Church? and, if he were not, where was it?"

This question about Luther is, in fact, no difficulty at all to us. Luther was not a member of the Church of England and Ireland. Nor was that Church founded by Luther; nor did it even consist of followers of Luther—though agreeing with Luther in many things. Our correspondent will agree with us that there was a Church in England before the Reformation. We say that very Church rejected some errors which it had formerly held: rejecting error does not make a Church cease to be a Church; because it is not holding error that constitutes a Church. If any one can show us that the Church of England and Ireland at the Reformation rejected any part of the Catholic faith, as it was held in the first ages, then we willingly admit that she ceased to be a true Church. But no one has shown us anything of this kind yet. And how can they, so long as she holds all the Catholic creeds.

We are truly happy to see that our correspondent does not reject the doctrine of St. Augustine, or count it preposterous in its consequences. We trust that friendly and candid discussion may yet bring him and us to be Catholics altogether and alike.

### ORIGEN A HERETIC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As Mr. E. Power (most unreasonably, I think,) still asserts that you have yet given nothing against Origen, "more convincing than than mere assertion or individual opinion," will you allow me to refer him to St. Augustine de civitate Dei lib. 21. cap. 17.

St. Augustine there says—

"Illam (i.e. Origenem) non immerito reprobavit ecclesia."

"The Church, with good reason, hath rejected him (Origen)."

And the chief ground of this rejection he explains to be, that Origen held that *all* future punishments, even those of Satan, were purgatorial.

The Benedictine editor adds the following note:—

"St. Jerome testifies that the errors of Origen were

condemned by Pope Anastasius (Apol. adv. Ruff.\* and epist. 78 ad Pammach); also by Theophilus, in a Council of Alexandria; after the time of Augustine, also, by Pope Vigilius and the Emperor Justinian. The fifth Œcumenical Council condemned the impious and absurd dogmas of Origen with many anathemas."

I know not, with this before him, how any Roman Catholic can continue to cite Origen as a faithful exponent of the Church's mind, and especially on the doctrine of purgatory.

I am, sir, yours,

DIEGO.

### FARMING OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

WHEAT sowing should now be proceeded with—completed within the month, if possible; and as the season advances, the quantity of seed should be increased.

Winter Vetches should be sown, if omitted last month, and finished as early as possible; so late in the season, they are best sown in ridges, and the water furrows well cleared up.

Bere.—Winter barley and bere and rye may be sown any time during the month, either for soiling, or to stand for seed.

Beans and Peas.—The sowing of winter beans, such as the Russian or Mazagan, should be no longer delayed; and gray peas may also be sown.

Swede Turnips, Mangold-wurzel, Carrots, and Parsnips should be all lifted, and stored early in the month. For details, see Operations for last month.

Parsnips for table use are better left in the land, and lifted fresh and fresh as required; but large field crops, intended for cattle-feeding, should now be lifted and stored.

Stall-feeding.—The cattle put up last month should now be so much accustomed to hand-feeding and house-management, as to be thriving rapidly; and their daily rations of turnips, oil-cake, bean, or other meal, be generally on the increase, till they get from 6 to 9 lbs. of oil-cake, or a compound of 4 to 6 lbs. of bean-meal, and 2 to 3 lbs. of oil-cake, according to size; they must be kept dry and warm, and well-bedded down with clean straw.

Sheep, also, intended for house-feeding, should soon be placed under cover; and when just put in should have cut turnips given them, very sparingly at first, to prevent scouring, when the allowance may be gradually increased to 1½ or 2 stones, with from ½ to 1 lb. of oil-cake, bean, or barley meal daily.

Breeding Ewes, by the close of the month, should be removed from the ram, and be allowed a spacious run on their winter pastures, which should be sound and dry, with good shelter to resort to in case of storms, and free access to good, sound hay.

Lambs, also, should now have good, sweet, but not rank pastures, and free access to dry, well-littered covered hovels, with hay, and be supplied with cut turnips, rather sparingly, just as much daily as they can eat up clean, and no more.

Stores.—Sheep should also have a liberal supply of roots and meal; and, as a general rule with all sheep, should have access to suit. The feet of sheep should also be constantly attended to, kept pared, and clean; and if there be any tendency to soreness or tenderness, dress immediately with the butyr of antimony.

Pigs.—Both fattening and stores should now have abundance of cooked food. The stores on steamed turnips and beans, with the offal from the dairy and kitchen; but those fattening should have a liberal allowance of grain with their turnips and potatoes. By the end of the month it will be a good time to send the sows to the brawn.

Grass Lands.—Continue manuring the grazing and meadow lands, with rich composts, farm-yard manure, bones, marl, or manure-gravel.

Water Meadows.—The sluices, ducts, and drains for irrigation should be looked to, and put in order; and any necessary alterations or improvements made without delay; that advantage may now be taken by those having a command of water to commence flooding the water meadows; and that those dependant on floods may be prepared to take advantage of them when they occur.

Fences.—This is a good time to plash and lay old fences; and lay out and plant new ones, when requisite.

Potatoes should still be planted in dry weather; early varieties and early planting being the best security from the disease.

Odds and Ends.—Keep the flail or thrashing-machine at work, to supply fresh straw for the stock; and, as the state of the market may advise, for the sale of grain; keep the teams either at plough or cart; go on draining and subsoiling where necessary; plough up grass lands where intended; scour out ditches and water courses; repair gates and roads; turn over compost heaps; cart home fuel, limestone, &c.; proceed with planting, felling timber, and cleansing coppices; and see that the water let over the irrigated meadows flows freely and constantly, without stagnating on the surface, and that the outlets are free and unobstructed.

\* "Quid facient epistolæ Theophilus episcopi? quid Pape Anastasii in toto orbe hæreticum persecutores?" Who the heretic was that was to be thus persecuted over the whole world, we learn from the previous sentence—"Non valet apud eos super Origenis damnatione episcoporum auctoritas." St. Jerome Apol. adv. Ruinun, lib. 1, p. 196.